

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 \* \* \*

6 Michael Rodriguez,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Naphcare, Inc., et. al,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-02344-RFB-DJA


**Order**

11 Before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Michael Rodriguez' motion to extend the time for him  
12 to file a reply to Defendants' responses to Plaintiff's motion to stay. (ECF No. 312). Plaintiff  
13 mailed his motion to extend on July 22, 2022. (*Id.*). His deadline to file his reply to Defendants'  
14 responses passed that same day. (*Id.*).

15 Under Local Rule IA 6-1(a), a motion to extend time made after the expiration of the  
16 specified period will not be granted unless the movant demonstrates that the failure to file the  
17 motion before the deadline expired was the result of excusable neglect. Plaintiff has made that  
18 showing here. Plaintiff explains that, because he is incarcerated, he did not receive Defendants'  
19 responses until a few days before his reply was due. As a result, he was unable to file his reply  
20 until after the deadline passed.

21 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to extend time (ECF No. 312) is  
22 **granted**. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to detach Plaintiff's reply—attached to his motion  
23 at ECF No. 312 at pages 14-19—and file it on the docket. The Court will consider this reply  
24 timely filed.

25 DATED: August 15, 2022

26   
27 **DANIEL J. ALBREGTS**  
28 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**